REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the July 23, 2008 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment C amends claims 14, 24, and 32. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-38, and 40 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 24, 26-31, and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. App. 2002/012071 to Bantz et al. (hereafter Bantz) in view of U.S. Pub. App. 2003/0100326 to Grube et al. (hereafter Grube) further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,896 to Kariya et al. (hereafter Kariya).

Bantz discloses a system of event routing services. (Abstract). Bantz teaches the event generator in the local server filters business events and sends a notification of the occurrence of a particular business event to all of the listeners that have requested notification. (Page 2, paragraph 30). Additionally, Bantz teaches subscribers sign up and are registered for services with a service provider. (Page 5, paragraph 52; FIG. 4).

Grube discloses a system for sharing location and route information between communication units that are subscribed to a group location sharing service. (Abstract). The group location sharing service is event-based, such that the communication units may form a subset of a talkgroup desiring to actively participate or monitor an event. (Abstract). A subscriber receives an acknowledgement in response to a service initiation or subscription request. (Page 10, paragraph 67).

Kariya discloses a system for providing a mobile subscriber with local information. (Abstract). URLs of **web pages related to specific regions are grouped into tables** where each table corresponds to a specific region. (Column 4, lines 28-33). When a user requests local representative URL, the system creates a new web page containing the list of URLs contained in the corresponding table. (Column 4, lines 33-35). In other words, **Kariya merely groups URLs based on geographic location**.

<u>Claims 1, 24, and 37</u>

In contrast to the cited art, the present application relates to systems and methods including a **topic identifier associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator** (URL) **relative to the domain of the content provider**. For example, claim 1 recites "**extracting request information** from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a plurality of topic identifiers, **each said topic identifier being associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the domain of the content provider**." That is, **the topic identifier is associated with a particular content provider**. According to aspects of the invention, a topic is a named set of notifications concerning a certain interest among the subscribers. (Page 18 paragraph 47; FIG. 5D). For example, **a topic is specified as a uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the content provider's domain** (e.g., /bl/hexadecimal_identifier, where hexadecimal_identifier is a numeric value specified in hexadecimal). (Page 18, paragraph 47; FIG. 5D). Furthermore, a subscriber can also subscribe to a content provider, while being agnostic about topics (e.g., /.). (Page 18, paragraph 47).

As explained above, the cited art merely teaches the categorization of web pages based on location. Applicants submit that the cited art fails to teach, suggest or make obvious the claimed "**extracting request information from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a plurality of topic identifiers, each said topic identifier being associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the domain of the content provider**." Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.* U.S., No. 04-1350, 4/30/07. However, in this rejection, neither the **element** of **extracting request information from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a plurality of topic identifiers, each said topic identifier being associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the domain of the content provider** nor the **result** of **executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information for each of the plurality of topic identifiers**, is found in the combined art.

Advantageously, a content provider can manage its topics and subscriptions thus leveraging the capabilities of the same notification system as other content providers without impacting the topics and subscriptions of the other content providers. Nothing in the cited art addresses this significant advantage of the claimed invention.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. Additionally, independent claims 24 and 37 includes limitations similar to claim 1 so that claims 24 and 37 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 3, and 5-13, 25-31, 38, and 40 depend from claims 1, 24, and 37, respectively, and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 24, and 37.

Claim 14

Claim 14 as amended, recites

querying a user profile store for profile information corresponding to each of the user identifiers of the requests;
querying a <u>messaging service</u> based on the user identifier <u>for additional data</u> to determine use of said messaging service by the user associated with the user identifier;
determining routing information for a notification based on the profile information <u>and the additional data</u> for each <u>user identifiers</u>; and
creating a subscription for the users corresponding to the topic identifiers by executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information, wherein the selected notification management function is related to the management of subscriptions associated with the content provider corresponding to the content provider identifier of the request and **<u>wherein the subscription for the user includes the determined routing information corresponding to the user</u>**.

For example, when subscribing a user, the Subscriber object is used to make an asynchronous call to the messaging service to get some additional data for a smarter routing of the created subscriptions. (FIG. 5A; paragraph 41). In particular, an async request is performed to deliver a notification to messaging service and the routing will be determined from the return code from the async request. (Paragraph 44).

Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known

methods to produce no more than predictable results[1]. However, in this rejection, neither the **element** of **querying a messaging service based on the user identifier for additional data to determine if the user associated with the user identifier utilizes the messaging service** nor the **result** of **determining routing information for a notification based on the profile information and the additional data for each user identifiers** is found in the combined art. In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 14 is allowable over the cited art. Additionally, independent claim 32 includes limitations similar to claim 14 so that claim 32 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 14 is allowable. Claims 17-23 and 33-36 depend from claims 14 and 32, respectively, and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claims 14 and 32.

Claims 10 and 15-36

Claims 10 and 15-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bantz and Grube, and Kariay, and further in view of U.S. Pat. 6,763,384 to Gupta et al. (hereafter Gupta). The Examiner asserts Gupta teaches receiving an acknowledgement in response to a request.

None of the above references are cited for, nor do any of these references teach or suggest "**extracting request information from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a plurality of topic identifiers, each said topic identifier being associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the domain of the content provider.**" Moreover, the cited art fails to show "**querying a messaging service based on the user identifier for additional data to determine use of the messaging service by the user associated with the user identifier** " as claimed and described in the present application. Accordingly, claim 1, 14, 24, and 32 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 10 and 15-36 depend from claims 1, 14, 24, and 32, respectively, and are allowable for at the least the same reasons as claims 1, 14, 24, and 32.

Claims 2, 21, 25, 36, and 38

Claims 2, 21, 25, 36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bantz and Grube, and Kariya, and further in view of Horvitz et al. (U.S. Pub. App. 2003/0101190), hereinafter Horvitz.

---

[1] *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, U.S. 550, USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Horvitz teaches a schema based notification system using XML documents. (Abstract) The schema is used to organize data based on type of data (e.g., email, web sites, etc). (Page 3, [0030]). A notification schema represents metadata about the subscription of a service to a source of information. (Page 7, [0064]).

The Horvitz reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Bantz, Grube, and Kariya and none of the cited references, separately or in combination, teach or suggest **"querying a messaging service based on the user identifier for additional data to determine use of the messaging service by the user associated with the user identifier."** These references also fail to show "extracting request information from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a plurality of topic identifiers, **each said topic identifier being associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the domain of the content provider"** and **" executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information for each of the plurality of topic identifiers".** Accordingly, claims 1, 14, 24, 32, and 37 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 2, 21, 25, 36, and 38 depend from claims 1, 14, 24, 32, and 37, respectively and are allowable for at the least the same reasons as claims 1, 14, 24, 32, and 37.

Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bantz and Grube, and Kariya, and further in view of Linderman (U.S. Pub. App. 2002/0032790), hereinafter Linderman.

Linderman teaches a system for communicating over the internet using a single protocol. The method of this reference uses a translator box to translate SOAP packet on second side of firewall to appropriate command for network element.

None of the above references are cited for, nor do any of these references teach or suggest "extracting request information from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a plurality of topic identifiers, **each said topic identifier being associated with a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL) relative to the domain of the content provider"** and **"executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information for each of the plurality of topic identifiers"** as claimed and described in the present application. Accordingly, claim 1 is

allowable over the cited art. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at the least the same reasons as claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Barbara A. Wilkey/

Barbara A. Wilkey, Reg. No. 62,986
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 345-7000

RMB/BAW/cjl